

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned Office action, all of the pending claims, claims 1-6, were rejected. Claims 1-2 and 5-6 were rejected under Section 102 over *Wiberg*. And, claims 3-4 were rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of *Wiberg* and *Wallentin*. Additionally, claims 3-4 were rejected under Section 112, second paragraph, for a recitation in line 1 of claim 3 that lacks antecedent basis.

Responsive to the rejections of the claims, independent claims 1 and 6 have been amended in manners believed better to distinguish the invention of the present application over the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

With respect to claim 1, the claim has been amended, now to recite that the broadcast system information is read before the end of an expiration time limit minus a threshold. And, the claim has been further amended, further to recite that the updated system information is stored when the user equipment determines that a time since a last reading of the broadcast system information is greater than the expiration time limit minus the threshold. Claim 6 has been analogously amended.

Support for the amendments is found, for instance, on page 6, lines 7-9, and page 8, lines 3-8.

As now-amended, claims 1 and 6 are believed to recite subject matter different than that disclosed in *Wiberg* and *Wallentin*, taken alone or in combination.

In the Office action, the Examiner acknowledged that *Wiberg* fails to disclose a threshold being greater or less than a repetition period for system information. Review of *Wiberg* indicates that the reference further fails to disclose reading of broadcast information before the end of an expiration time limit minus a threshold nor or storing updated system information when the user equipment determines that the time since a last reading of the broadcast system information is greater than the expiration time limit minus a threshold. More generally, *Wiberg* fails to disclose broadcast system information that is reacquired by user equipment before the end of an expiration time limit associated with the previous system information. And, there is no disclosure of reacquiring the information at a time that is greater than the expiration time limit

minus the threshold. Claims 1 and 6, as now-recited, therefore, recite subject matter that differs with that set forth in *Wiberg*.

Wallentin also fails to disclose system information with an associated expiration time limit, of reading broadcast system information before the end of an expiration time limit minus the threshold, or of storing up-dated system information in user equipment when the user equipment determines the times since the last reading of the broadcast system information is greater than the expiration time limit minus the threshold. Review of *Wallentin*, to the contrary, appears to refer to the making of a decision based upon whether a measured queue length for up-link and down-link exceeds a threshold, and if the threshold is exceeded, provision is made to select a dedicated type of channel. There is no reference to expiration time limits, reading broadcast system information, or of storing updated system information. *Wallentin*, alone or in combination with *Wiberg*, also fails to disclose the subject matter recited in claims 1 and 6 as now-amended.

The Applicants note that the disclosure of the present application identifies the problem that between an expiry time limit of system information and the reacquiring of information, there is a period during which there is out-of-date, or no, valid information. Additionally, the time to acquire such new data is finite, which can impose a delay on the time before which the new information can be used.

The recited subject matter, set forth in the claims, addresses this problem, and information is reacquired at a time greater than an expiration time limit minus a threshold.

Wiberg suffers from the problem of lack of valid system information at a user equipment device. There is no incentive in *Wiberg* to arrive at the recited invention as *Wiberg* is concerned with the avoidance of re-reading of previously acquired information, not with the problem of invalid, or no, information. While column 3, lines 40-63, addresses re-rereading by using tag values that identify whether information has already been stored, this approach would not lead a skilled person toward the invention of the present application. In fact, *Wiberg* points away from the present invention as *Wiberg* emphasizes the use of values up to their expiry, e.g., column 16, lines 56-60, in which information is read every second, the information having a one-second expiry time, and, preferably, information deletion thereafter to force the re-reading of system

information. *Wiberg* wholly fails to suggest reacquiring prior to expiration minus a threshold. *Wiberg* fails even to mention the definition of a threshold, or use of such as threshold, in conjunction with an expiration time limit.

Wallentin also suffers from the problem of lack of valid system information at a user equipment device. There is not incentive in *Wallentin* to arrive at the invention of the present application based upon the disclosure of *Wallentin*. *Wallentin* is concerned merely with the selection of channels, and the reference does not even refer to expiration time limits or of the reading of broadcast system information and storage of updated system information in the specific circumstances set forth in claims 1 and 6, as now-recited. The thresholds referred to in *Wallentin* are not technically associated with an expiration time limit, thus leading a skilled person away from the invention, as now-recited. And, a combination of *Wiberg* and *Wallentin* also does not direct a skilled person toward the recited invention as the combination still fundamentally fails to associate an expiration time limit with a threshold and includes no suggestion of storing updated system information in the user equipment device when user equipment determines that a time since a last reading of the broadcast system information is greater than the expiration time limit minus the threshold.

For all of these reasons, therefore, claims 1 and 6, as now-recited, are believed to be distinguishable over *Wiberg* and *Wallentin*, taken alone or in combination. As the dependent claims include all the limitations of their parent claim, the dependent claims are believed to be patentably distinguishable over the cited references for the same reasons as those given with respect to their parent claim.


With respect to the Section 112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 3-4, amendment made to claim 1 is believed to provide the antecedent basis for the recitation in claim 3 of the threshold.

In light of the foregoing, independent claims 1 and 6, as now-amended, and dependent claims 2-5, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration for allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Appl. No. 10/775,030
Amdt. dated January 5, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3 Jan 06


Robert H. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,922

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4201
Fax: (214) 706-4242
robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com